

**REMARKS**

In light of the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

All of the claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of U.S. Published Application 2002/0013850 to Mitchell, U.S. Patent No. 6,847,992 to Haitzuka, U.S. Patent No. 6,836,799 to Philyaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,701,362 to Subramonian, U.S. Patent No. 6,606,581 to Nickerson and/or Official Notice. The rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

An embodiment of the invention is directed to a method for personalizing information presented to a user at a host web site. By way of example, the user may access the host web site from different locations such as a user's office or a user's home. The devices used at the user's office and at the user's home are each assigned a separate unique ID. The host web site monitors the content of other web sites that the user visits and on which device the user is accessing the other web sites. On subsequent visits, the host web site will present information to the user based on the assigned unique ID of the device being used and the content that was previously accessed from that device.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Mitchell did not specifically teach assigning a unique ID to each device among a plurality of devices. Instead the Examiner relied on Haitzuka to teach this feature and, more specifically, the Examiner relied on col. 2, lines 64-67 and col. 3, lines 1-3 of Haitzuka. Further, the Examiner stated with regard to Haitzuka, that a cookie is inherently known to contain device identification. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Haitzuka discloses that a cookie is a mechanism that allows a web server to store its own information about a user on

the user's own computer. (Haitsuka: col. 3, lines 7-9.) Cookies record a user's preferences with respect to a particular website. (Haitsuka: col. 3, lines 2-3.) Although Haitsuka arguably teaches or implies storing user information in a cookie, there is no disclosure for storing a unique ID for a user device in the cookie. As such, because Haitsuka fails to disclose a unique ID for a device, Haitsuka fails to disclose a step for assigning a unique ID to each device among a plurality of devices, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Mitchell and Haitsuka does not disclose assigning a unique ID to each device among a plurality of devices. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied prior art.

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from one of claims 1 and 15, and, at least due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied prior art.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Mayush Singhvi

Registration No.: 50,431  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

612935\_1.DOC